



# MINUTES

## Regular Meeting of the Planning Commission

**MONDAY, October 15, 2018**

City Council Chambers

1 Civic Center Drive, San Marcos, CA 92069

### CALL TO ORDER

At 6:30 p.m. Planning Commission Chair Norris called the meeting to order.

### PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Commissioner Magemeneas led the Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag.

### ROLL CALL

The Secretary called the roll:

PRESENT: COMMISSIONERS: NORRIS, FLODINE, MATTHEWS, MUSGROVE, OLEKSY, CARROLL,  
MAGEMENEAS

ALTERNATE COMMISSIONERS IN AUDIENCE: NONE

ABSENT: MINNERY

Also present were: Planning Manager, Karen Brindley; Deputy City Attorney, Avneet Sidhu; Principal Planner Joe Farace; Senior Civil Engineer, Lewis Clapp; Office Specialist Susie Neveu

### ORAL AND WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS

NONE

### CONSENT CALENDAR

#### **1. APPROVAL OF MINUTES, 11/20/17 & 5/07/18**

#### Action:

COMMISSIONER OLEKSY MOVED TO APPROVE CONSENT CALENDAR AS PRESENTED; SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER MATTHEWS. MOTION CARRIED BY A UNANIMOUS VOTE.

**Planning Manager Brindley:** Acknowledged both alternates were serving at tonight's meeting, Magemeneas is filling in for Minnery and Carroll is sitting in for Jacoby. She announced Bill Jacoby passed away this summer and recognized his decade of service on the San Marcos Planning Commission.

**Chairman Norris:** Thanked Brindley and noted he was a friend and a fellow Commissioner. He will be missed. Norris offered Commissioners a chance to speak on Jacoby's passing during Planning Commissioners' Comments.



## **PUBLIC HEARINGS**

### **2. Project No:** SP 18-0001, CUP 18-0004 and Addendum to MND 03-681

**Applicant:** Loma San Marcos LLC

**Request:** This action consists of a Specific Plan Amendment and Conditional Use Permit modification to allow for the reconfiguration of development phasing associated with previously approved film production facility within a 179,535 square foot area consisting of 61,650 square feet of film production (movie studio); 108,135 square feet of storage; and 9,750 square feet of media office space in an existing building in the Loma San Marcos Specific Plan Area (formerly San Marcos Studio Specific Plan Area). The 61,650 square foot movie studio will be utilized in part for youth sports courts for the filming of recreationally competitive games with live audiences as well as other commercial filming activities.

**Environmental Determination:** An Addendum to the previously adopted Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND03-681) was prepared for the project pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).

**Location of Property:** The project site is located at 1601 San Elijo Road, more particularly described as A Portion of the Northwest Quarter of Section 33, Township 12 South, Range 3 West, San Bernardino Base and Meridian, in the City of San Marcos and County of San Diego, State of California according to the official plat thereof, Assessor Parcel Numbers: 223-080-41-00, and 223-080-42-00.

**Principal Planner Farace:** Presented the staff report and a PowerPoint presentation.

**Chairman Norris:** Thanked Farace for all his work on his project, putting the presentation together and opened the floor up for comments from Commission and Staff.

**Commissioner Matthews:** Also thanked Farace for the presentation and asked Farace if there was a guarantee for how long the open space around this project is supposed to last.

**Principal Planner Farace:** Replied that open space that is managed by Center for Natural Lands Management is dedicated open space and will be in perpetuity. The area across the street that is dedicated open space is currently designated opening space in the general plan and the City is currently going through the process to dedicate the land and place an easement over it as well.

**Commissioner Oleksy:** Asked staff to clarify project description Section 4, Project concept B regarding a paragraph that details opportunities for the rental of sound stages for social events. He noted under permitted uses, he didn't see a listing of special events and anything not listed as a permitted use is strictly prohibited. He wanted an explanation for Resolution PC 18-4723, section H-19 stating special events are prohibited from occurring on site.



**Principal Planner Farace:** Replied that it was an allowance that was part of the original 2004 Specific Plan. Rental allowed for special events pertaining to Loma San Marcos' use, like wrap parties. Not for general public or corporate events.

**Commissioner Flodine:** Proposed a clause to clarify Section H-19 stating special events not associated with film production are prohibited.

**Commissioner Oleksy:** Agreed that some clarity needs to go into plan as some point.

**Commissioner Matthews:** Commented that Page 16, second to last paragraph provides clarification on special event usage.

**Planning Manager Brindley:** Commented that any proposed modification to the conditions, if there is a motion that comes later, can be the recommendation of the Planning Commission as well.

**Chairman Norris:** Yes, once proper verbiage is worked out, we can include it with the recommendation.

**Commissioner Flodine:** Commented that staff is more inclined to look at conditions of approval than take out a dusty specific plan.

**Commissioner Carroll:** Confirmed that what Commission is being asked to approve is just for Phase 1A and asked if Phase 1B require a separate meeting and approval?

**Principal Planner Farace:** Said no, that phase 1B is approved. It's actually the approved phase 1A.

**Commissioner Carroll:** Confirmed that Phase 1B can happen no matter what and what we are being asked to approve so the City can start this portion before you do 1B. Additionally, he asked if the large development that is in the works next door, is the planned traffic light that is going to be incorporated in later phases, the same light that the proposed apartments are planning to use to access San Elijo Road?

**Principal Planner Farace:** Stated that what is going on next door is in the preliminary planning stages and didn't know if that level of detail had been decided.

**Commissioner Carroll:** Stated that the County has accepted the Methane mitigation plan and asked if the City had any concerns about Methane.

**Principal Planner Farace:** Answered that the City doesn't have any Methane concerns.

**Commissioner Musgrove:** Asked if the City is aware of any plans the County has for their adjacent property, other than the monitoring of the landfill? Any plans for compaction? Are there any plans for rehabilitation of land into a park?

**Principal Planner Farace:** Answered that he is not aware of anything taking place at this moment.



**Commissioner Flodine:** Asked two questions. Did the Fire and Sheriff Departments review this proposal and do they have any comments?

**Principal Planner Farace:** Answered that they did review it and said we didn't receive any comments from the Sheriff. We did receive comments from the City Fire Marshal and the new conditions have been incorporated into CUP 18-0004.

**Commissioner Flodine:** Asked where the youth sports are coming from? Are the teams or leagues part of City's Parks and Recreation? Are they travel ball teams or from the schools?

**Principal Planner Farace:** Answered that the applicant would explain in more detail, but from what he understands the teams are travel and club leagues that would be using the site run by San Diego Sol. Sports primarily include basketball, but will use courts for soccer and volleyball too.

**Chairman Norris:** Asked a couple of questions that then opened it up to the public. He asked about secondary fire access. He wanted to make sure as we move forward that the Fire Marshal is not going to require any secondary access.

**Principal Planner Farace:** Answered that the Fire Marshal did review the plans and is aware of the existing driveway. He didn't provide any additional comments regarding the need for secondary access on the site.

**Chairman Norris:** Stated he didn't see any showers, restrooms, or changing rooms on the Loma San Marcos Specific Plan. He also noted that the water pressure was 20psi which seemed very low. Wanted to know how they would serve showers or a fire service.

**Principal Planner Farace:** Explained there are onsite bathrooms and locker rooms and deferred the 20psi question to the applicant.

**Commissioner Musgrove:** Asked if there were wet or dry stand pipes on the exterior for fire service, other than what would be needed for commercial or residential use?

**Principal Planner Farace:** Pointed out on the PowerPoint where the restrooms and locker rooms were located.

**Chairman Norris:** Commented that the exterior lighting was low pressure sodium and we have gotten away from that and why aren't we using LED; thinking about San Marcos Climate Action Plan. Can we get that changed?

**Principal Planner Farace:** Answered that we can look into lighting.

**Chairman Norris:** Continued to discuss Climate Action Plan, what has been put aside for EV charging as it pertains to the Cal Green Code.



**Principal Planner Farace:** No EV charging proposed as part of initial phase.

**Chairman Norris:** Asked if when the parking structure goes up if that's when the infrastructure will go in?

**Principal Planner Farace:** He said it would go in with the Phase 1B, because there would be a greater extent of interior improvement that would be done.

**Commissioner Matthews:** Asked if infrastructure would be automatic in Phase 1B or do we need to specify that now?

**Principal Planner Farace:** Stated it would be automatic.

**Planning Manager Brindley:** Clarified in the conditions of approval, regarding the concern on water pressure; here are a few conditions that are included in the Resolution starting on Page 12, Condition 24 and Page 13, Condition 30 and 31 that require approval through Vallecitos Water District for each phase. There would be a requirement that the applicant must obtain a will serve letter from that agency.

**Chairman Norris:** Invited Jason Simmons, applicant, to speak to some of the questions and opened it up to the public.

**Jason Simmons, applicant's representative:** Commented on the 20 psi being a typo. The 10" water line is correct, it's what is there now and is adequate for fire. The building was built right; there is definitely adequate fire, fire sprinklers and water. Property owner has done a good job of maintaining the property. EV charging stations and solar will be part of future phases, from Phase 1B and on. There are changing rooms and bathrooms; 6 or 7 sets in the main building. They have been in talks with San Diego Sol and have finalized that they will be the teams used in the filming. Basketball, volleyball and soccer are the confirmed sports to be filmed. The landfill has been revegetated with Coastal Sage. The same traffic light would serve Copper Hills and proposed development with a shared entrance and cost. Applicant is fine with adjustment to conditions for H-19 regarding special events. Applicant requests an adjustment to H-2, regarding hours of operation and how they might operate in that space. They would like to adjust conditions to be open on weekends 8am-9pm. Applicant is proposing LED lighting in portion where youth sports will be filmed. Future phases including 1B and on will have LED lighting throughout will be mandatory.

**Commissioner Matthews:** Confirmed 20 psi was a typo.

**Commissioner Magemeneas:** Commented that most sports facilities do not have showers.

**Commissioner Musgrove:** Asked about on site security. Wanted to know about developer and owner providing 24/7 security.

**Jason Simmons, applicant's representative:** Answered that there is a caretaker that lives on site that provides 24/7 security.



**Commissioner Magemeneas:** Asked about an economic impact plan. Have you done analysis on the additive aspects to local commerce?

**Jason Simmons, applicant's representative:** Answered we have not specifically analyzing this project, but ones like it indicate positive economic impact.

**Chairman Magemeneas:** Commented that traffic will be redirected for Phase 1A towards the Town Center to benefit local businesses.

**Chairman Norris:** Expressed surprise that there hadn't been more discussion on the traffic signal or lack of.

**Commissioner Carroll:** Asked about concessions during sports tournaments.

**Jason Simmons, applicant's representative:** Commented food trucks are expected to show up to the tournaments, but no concession stand.

**Commissioner Carroll:** Asked the question, looking at the site plan, will the primary lot be the front lot and the lot in the back to be an overflow lot? Will the front lot be gated?

**Jason Simmons, applicant's representative:** Answered yes to both questions.

**Commissioner Carroll:** Stated currently the site is used today as the entry way for a parking lot for hikers and bikers, under this plan will there be any place for local residents to park and access the open space?

**Jason Simmons, applicant's representative:** Answered yes and confirmed residents will not lose access to this parking lot to access open space. The proposed plan's conditions restrict the parking of youth sports activities. It is County land. The general public can park in this lot, the sports activities participants cannot.

**Commissioner Carroll:** Asked about San Diego Sol's experience with filming youth sports.

**Jason Simmons, applicant's representative:** Answered they will be working with an experienced Hollywood production company and San Diego Sol will run the sports portion. They will be using 7 or 8 cameras to film. He added there is no intent, at this time, to film outdoors and any night filming would require sign off by the City Manager.

**Commissioner Carroll:** Asked for clarification on where the barrier is going to be located. Will it be in the middle of San Elijo Road or is the entry way going to be designed so you can only turn left and will you still be able to make a left into the facility from San Elijo Road?

**Jason Simmons, applicant's representative:** Answered the barrier will actually allow for a right hand turn and, yes, you will be able to make a left from San Elijo Road into the facility. There will be a triangle barrier that blocks traffic from making a left hand out but allows for left turn in.





**Commissioner Carroll:** Asked if the intent is to have activities happen during off hours due to traffic concerns?

**Jason Simmons, applicant's representative:** Answered to be clear the hours are 3pm-9pm for youth sports so morning traffic is not impacted.

### **OPEN PUBLIC HEARING**

**Kevin O'Donnell, resident:** Commented he really encouraged Planning Commission not to approve this project as he lives in area and has three main concerns. The first is traffic. There is already too much traffic on San Elijo Road. Second issue he mentioned is concern for children walking down the road after school. Before voting go look at traffic on San Elijo Road. Safety is a big concern. This third concern was about home values; he doesn't see home values increasing by approving this project. He sees home prices decreasing. He is also concerned with vagrants, people coming in that don't have anything to do with our community. Other issues include noise and lighting. If this project is approved there will be a negative impact on the community. Asked why the owner isn't showing up to Planning Commission meeting. He asked commissioners to step back and look at this community and the impact of this project. Wanted clarification on other commercial filming, not defined. He is very concerned about parties and noise, even if it is a film party. Biggest concern is the traffic being filtered up the hill, cutting through the gas station. The whole Town Square is backed up with traffic. Another concern is no traffic light, no safety for kids walking down the hill. He commented that the hours of 3pm-9pm are ridiculous for a community full of families and 8am-9pm on the weekends. He urged Planning Commission not to pass this project. Asked the question as to why are we adding this project. What value does this add to the community?

### **CLOSE PUBLIC HEARING**

**Commissioner Flodine:** Addressed Mr. O'Donnell and commented that he lives in San Elijo Hills and travels that road every day. He continued to say a lot of the history of this project is not known by the City. Asked staff to confirm that with the current approvals Warner Brothers could come in and open up in that site without coming to Planning Commission or City Council? It's an approved site. Regarding additional traffic for this project, it would be an additional 450 to 600 cars that would visit this facility. This is similar to the amount of cars that visit San Elijo Park. Baker Street would probably get an additional 480 cars he projected. He expressed concern about traffic speed and accidents. The road has a maximum speed limit of 45 mph from Rancho Santa Fe right until you get to the gas station and it becomes 25 mph. It becomes a speed trap. The concern with this project is that intersection, which will not have a signal with this current Phase 1A proposal, is in a 45 mph segment and people do not go 45 mph. Asked staff to seriously consider a transitional speed limit from 45 mph to perhaps a 30-35 mph to slow people down before the intersection.

**Commissioner Musgrove:** Clarified there are legal definitions of a speed trap and that portion of the roadway is actively surveyed. Commented that the 45 mph speed limit is determined based on 85% of the people that drive the road. He continued to say that to artificially install a speed limit sign, which might work visually, is one of the three definitions of a speed trap; posting a speed outside the permitted range.



There are some issues with the design; a curve in the road could cause some site distant issues. Asked staff about signalization of that intersection and when it would become signalized. Traffic at this point doesn't warrant a signal, but as volume increases, it does become a problem. Commented that traffic signals stop traffic, but don't slow it down. At this point, a different traffic analysis would be required of the roadway to determine what the general public believes is a safe speed and post it that way. Sheriff could be proactive down there and enforce the current speed limits. Invited Mr. O'Donnell to the Traffic Commission and suggested he send something in that could be an agenda item to address traffic concerns.

**Commissioner Carroll:** Agreed with Commissioner Flodine and Musgrove. Commented the overall increase in traffic with this project is minimal. Expressed some concerns with children walking from San Elijo Middle School (SEMS) to Old Creek Ranch, 7<sup>th</sup> and 8<sup>th</sup> graders, who are crossing a road with a couple of hundred cars a day making a right. He asked Commissioner Musgrove if this could be looked at during a Traffic Commission meeting for an agenda item in the future.

**Commissioner Magemeneas:** Thanked Mr. O'Donnell for his presentation. He commented that the Commission is very sensitive to child safety. He explained he sat down with Vice Mayor Jones about traffic issues and she laid down several counter measures. He commented that if this project is approved by City Council not to be discouraged, because you provided your concerns and suggestions.

**Chairman Norris:** Followed up by stating that at UCSD they are painting dashes on the roadway to slow traffic down. People perceive that the lanes are getting smaller and it slows traffic down. It is something to consider, not costly. The University also puts down lighted crosswalks that flash and give drivers a heads' up that a pedestrian is crossing. He wanted to see if the applicant or the City would look into these items to address some of the traffic concerns. His question to the City was would they consider putting markings on San Elijo Road and maybe a lighted pedestrian walk? He thanked Mr. O'Donnell for coming and presenting.

**Senior Civil Engineer Clapp:** Answered that the City typically wouldn't put something parallel to the traffic. Not typically done on a driveway. But Traffic Department has been looking at the transitional speed zone as result of the letter.

**Commissioner Flodine:** Suggested with the increase in the number of cars, perhaps look at painting a crosswalk for pedestrians walking down San Elijo Road.

**Commissioner Carroll:** Asked if a temporary barrier is going to be put in place, why can't they paint a crosswalk at the same time?

**Commissioner Musgrove:** Stated that generally crosswalks go in when you have intersecting public highways not private property. Asked the question, if the land is County property, is it generally open to the public?

**Senior Civil Engineer Clapp:** Answered yes that is something we could look into and the point is well taken with it being County property and the easement is limited to a certain section. We can have Traffic staff look into.





**Chairman Norris:** Asked everyone to keep in mind that this is a three year Conditional Use Permit; something has to happen at the end of three years. It either goes back to what it is now or it goes to Phase 1B.

**Principal Planner Farace:** Answered Chairman Norris that he was correct.

**Commissioner Flodine:** Asked about next steps for Staff and the applicant.

**Chairman Norris:** Asked if we could put next steps in the recommendation?

**Planning Manager Brindley:** Answered Chairman Norris that he was correct. Staff indicated we have already touched base with Traffic Division regarding a request to review the potential for a transitional speed. We can certainly come back to Planning Commission with an update at our next meeting. Regarding the potential for a crosswalk, commented that anything that does conclude on that will require County approval.

**Chairman Norris:** Confirmed that Commissioners wanted to add verbiage to H-2, H-19 and the request to investigate mitigating factors at that traffic intersection and crosswalk.

**Commissioner Flodine:** Asked if it was Commissions desire to create or add a condition to this project for the crosswalk or traffic speed calming. Is the condition to ask the applicant to talk with the City and the County or is the request for the City to discuss internally?

**Commissioner Matthews:** Stated it feels like there are too many loose ends to make a recommendation of any sort.

**Chairman Norris:** Asked Deputy City Attorney Avneet Sidhu for help on how Commission should proceed.

**Deputy City Attorney Sidhu:** Answered that it depends. She said the first (2) Amendments are clear, you want to amend H-2 and H-19. Regarding the traffic, crosswalk issue, because we don't know if the proposal will be accepted by County, you could do one of two things. You could make it a condition requiring applicant to investigate or you could direct staff to do the investigation and report to City Council.

**Commissioner Musgrove:** Agreed that staff, the Engineer Department, would know the conditions and parameters if a crosswalk is appropriate and then what mitigations need to come into play with the property owner being the County.

**Deputy City Attorney Sidhu:** Said the question between the two may be timing, not sure when it is scheduled to go to City Council. Is there time for a discussion and a report to be investigated before City Council?



**Planning Manager Brindley:** Answered Sidhu that a City Council hearing had not been docketed at this point; however it was anticipated that it could go as early as November 13, 2018.

**Deputy City Attorney Sidhu:** Replied that it depends what the Commissioners want to have happen and how soon. Do they want it to be reported to City Council or do they want it to be a condition of approval.

**Commissioner Flodine:** Stated he would like to see it at City Council.

**Commissioner Oleksy:** Commented that what we are discussing is a City problem, not a developer problem. The developer has the right to develop the land and he invested a lot of money.

**Chairman Norris:** Commented about the safety concerns with the citizens.

**Chairman Matthews:** Commented since City Council has not docketed this for an agenda item, do we have the chance to bring this back to the Commission in a couple of weeks?

**Planning Manager Brindley:** Answered yes if that is the direction of the Commission.

**Commissioner Flodine:** Echoed what Mr. Oleksy said that this project highlights an existing problem along San Elijo Road. He doesn't want to hold up this proposal while the City and the County figure out the solution to the existing problem that is there without the project. His concern is that the City and County, because of the multiple reviews and the Engineering Departments talking, might be a six-month process and it might be that they can't do anything. Concerned the applicant will be delayed for a problem that has been there for twenty years. A study and recommendation from all departments and agencies should be brought to us or City Council.

**Commissioner Musgrove:** Agreed with Commissioner Flodine's perspective.

**Commissioner Magemeneas:** Stated that he concurs with Commissioners' Musgrove and Flodine. What we are looking at as a Commission is a modification amendment to a 2004 Plan.

**Commissioner Carroll:** Added as a Commission we feel there is a valid concern and want to make sure that there is a course of action that will be taken to address issues in a timely manner. What is a reasonable timeline for a study to be done?

**Commissioner Matthews:** Commented that the role of the Commission is to review what we feel is appropriate land use? This structure has been there for a long time, not being used and has the opportunity to be a revenue contributor to the City. If we agree on the land use, can we work on other issues as we move along?

**Commissioner Flodine:** Agreed with Commissioner Matthews. Commission doesn't need to make a decision about every aspect of the details.



**Deputy City Attorney Sidhu:** Commented another way to handle this is if it is the Commissioners desire to approve this project; then you could approve this project and then direct staff as a future agenda item, to bring back the issues that have been addressed. Therefore, it is not part of this project.

**Chairman Norris:** Concurred with Sidhu and said we can approve project and give staff direction to look into the feasibility with the County of putting a crosswalk in and report on future Commission.

**Deputy City Attorney Sidhu:** Agreed and said that would be a completely separate direction not part of the resolutions as part of this agenda item.

**Commissioner Musgrove:** Offered that this has come up before in the course of scope on the Traffic Commission. We make the recommendation but the report would go back to the Traffic Commission.

**Chairman Norris:** Asked if Commission could approve this project and put that as a different item for a future date?

**Planning Manager Brindley:** Responded you could certainly, as the City Attorney has indicated, make a motion to approve the project and then separately direct staff to coordinate with the Traffic Division and come back and report the findings at a future meeting.

**Commissioner Carroll:** Asked for clarification on what would be the actionable body, would it be this Commission or the Traffic?

**Chairman Norris:** Answered the Traffic Commission would look into that and report to Planning Commission on what they found.

**Senior Civil Engineer Clapp:** Stated that the Traffic Commission would look at that and if something was a safety issue, they would implement the change and come back to the Planning Commission as informational.

**Deputy City Attorney Sidhu:** Clarified, at that point, you couldn't make it a condition of this project.

**Chairman Norris:** Asked if everyone understands and asked for a recommendation and a motion.

**Action:**

COMMISSIONER OLEKSY MOVED TO APPROVE RESOLUTION NO. PC18-4722 AND RECOMMENDING CITY COUNCIL APPROVE A SPECIFIC PLAN AMENDMENT TO THE LOMA SAN MARCOS SPECIFIC PLAN (SP18-0001) AND SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER FLODINE AND CARRIED BY THE FOLLOWING ELECTRONIC VOTE:

AYES:	COMMISSIONERS: FLODINE, MATTHEWS, MUSGROVE, CARROLL, NORRIS, OLEKSY
NOES:	COMMISSIONERS: NONE
ABSENT:	COMMISSIONERS: MINNERY



ABSTAIN: COMMISSIONERS: MAGEMENEAS

**Commissioner Magemeneas:** Explained he was in favor of this project. He chose to abstain due to his private interest in constructing a multi-use sports and recreation facility for youth sports.

**Action:**

COMMISSIONER CARROLL MOVED TO APPROVE RESOLUTION NO. PC18-4723 WITH THE ADDENDUM RECOMMENDING THAT THE CITY COUNCIL APPROVE A MODIFICATION TO THE CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT (CUP18-0004) WITH REFERENCE TO THE SPECIFIC PLAN AREA WITH THE FOLLOWING MODIFICATIONS THAT SECTION H, PARAGRAPH #2 HOURS OF OPERATIONS SHALL BE 3PM-9PM ON WEEKDAYS AND 8AM-9PM ON WEEKENDS AND SECTION H, PARAGRAPH #19 SPECIAL EVENTS ARE PROHIBITED ON SITE, WITH THE EXCEPTION OF EVENTS ASSOCIATED WITH THE FILM PRODUCTION INDUSTRY RELATED TO THE MOVIE STUDIO USE AND SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER FLODINE AND CARRIED BY THE FOLLOWING ELECTRONIC VOTE:

AYES: COMMISSIONERS: FLODINE, MATTHEWS, MUSGROVE, CARROLL, NORRIS, OLEKSY  
NOES: COMMISSIONERS: NONE  
ABSENT: COMMISSIONERS: MINNERY  
ABSTAIN: COMMISSIONERS: MAGEMENEAS

**PUBLIC HEARINGS**

**3. Project No: PA18-0005**

**Applicant:** James Statser

**Request:** This action consists of reviewing the request to abandon two separate irrevocable offers of dedication for public highway purposes with the General Plan and recommending to the City Council the abandonment of the irrevocable offers of dedication. Staff's review finds that the offers of dedication are not included in the Mobility Element of the General Plan, are not consistent with the current alignment of Twin Oaks Valley Road, and are not needed.

**Environmental Determination:** Staff recommends an exemption under CEQA, as the proposed abandonment is not a project within the meaning of Section 15378 of the CEQA guidelines.

**Location of Property:** Multiple properties located south of San Elijo Road and Twin Oaks Valley Road will be affected by the abandonment of the offers of dedication. The APNs associated with these offers of dedication are 679-040-08-00, 679-040-04-00, 679-040-05-00, 222-121-16-00, 222-121-14-00, 222-121-37-00 222-121-34-00, 222-121-12-00 and 222-121-11-00.

**Planning Manager Brindley:** Acknowledged that this item moving forward to City Council will be on the consent calendar item rather than a public hearing item.

**Senior Civil Engineer Clapp:** Presented the staff report and a PowerPoint presentation.



**Planning Manager Brindley:** Recommended Planning Commission makes a recommendation to the City Council and encouraged that with any motion the acceptance of the environmental determination be included. This is not a project under CEQA.

#### **OPEN PUBLIC HEARING**

No public comments.

#### **CLOSE PUBLIC HEARING**

##### **Action:**

COMMISSIONER MATTHEWS MOVED TO APPROVE AS SET FORTH IN RESOLUTION NO. PC18-4734; SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER OLEKSY AND CARRIED BY THE FOLLOWING ELECTRONIC VOTE:

AYES:	COMMISSIONERS: MAGEMENEAS, FLODINE, MATTHEWS, MUSGROVE, CARROLL, NORRIS, OLEKSY
NOES:	COMMISSIONERS: NONE
ABSENT:	COMMISSIONERS: MINNERY
ABSTAIN:	COMMINSSINERS: NONE

#### **PLANNING MANAGER COMMENTS**

**Planning Manager Brindley:** Informed Planning Commission that the next meeting will be December 3, 2018. It is expected that the El Dorado II apartment project will come before the Commission as well as a Conditional Use Permit for an existing car sales lot.

#### **PLANNING COMMISSIONERS COMMENTS**

**Commissioner Carroll:** Asked for a recommendation for staff to do a report to give to Traffic Commission.

**Deputy City Attorney Sidhu:** Recommended that staff put it on a future agenda.

**Chairman Norris:** Requested staff to look into the option of installing crosswalks at San Elijo Hills into the movie studio complex and to work with County and Traffic Commission and report back to Planning Commission.

**Planning Manager Brindley:** Asked Chairman Norris if that also includes a request for staff to work with the Traffic Division on the transitional speed on San Elijo Road. He replied yes.

**Commissioner Flodine:** Commented that we lost a long time public servant in our City. Bill Jacoby was a friend and a good man.



**Chairman Matthews:** Said Bill Jacoby was very helpful at my first couple of meetings. He was gentle in his guidance. He is missed a lot.

**Chairman Norris:** Said he worked with Bill Jacoby on the Planning Commission for a few years and he always had some good insight. He was well loved. He was fortunate to work with him.

**Commissioner Magemeneas:** Stated unfortunately he did not get to know Bill Jacoby, but he always had a smile on his face. Made a motion that the December 3, 2018 meeting a beverage could be hosted in his honor and get to know each other better.

### **ADJOURNMENT**

At 8:32 p.m. Chairman Norris adjourned the meeting.

\_\_\_\_\_  
KEVIN NORRIS, CHAIRMAN  
CITY OF SAN MARCOS PLANNING COMMISSION

**ATTEST:**

\_\_\_\_\_  
SUSIE NEVEU, OFFICE SPECIALIST  
CITY OF SAN MARCOS PLANNING COMMISSION